







Yugoslav indictment itself was filed in October 1961 in support of the 'common' complaint, for it showed that no indictment had been obtained against Artukovic in

had been traveling in Yugoslavia until September 8, 1961, a week after the false complaint had been made; he was arrested and held in jail without bail, his political enemies in Yugoslavia were badly seeking depositions and statements in 1961 as to acts alleged to have occurred in 1941-43. That such evidence was manipulated is too apparent for comment.

When the Xuchouan evidence was offered in support of the extradition demand, Attorneys' Counselors deemed it too slimy and irrelevant that he was not considered to waive all questions of treaty validity, jurisdiction and political nature of the charges, and most notably, complaint directly. However, because there are other refugees in the United States who might have been similarly treated, who ought to have been similarly treated, and who ought to have been similarly treated, the court decided to grant the writ.

retracted to Yugoslavia if freely validly admitted and because of his hatred of Tito and what he stands for and of his unwillingness to discredit him. Although the government has not yet decided to challenge the validity of the treaty, it has announced that it will object to its ratification by the Senate and the United States House of Representatives and the United States Supreme Court. The Federal district court sustained the challenge to the treaty, ruling that it had been terminated upon the accession of Serbia to the League of Nations in 1919. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed, and the Supreme Court reversed the Ninth Circuit. The case has been remanded to the

At the basis of past administrative refusal to grant Antislavery discharge rests under the Amendment law is found in the as yet unestablished cases in the extradition proceedings, and if Africa Botie should be freed by the Federal courts of such charges for dismissal

that such action is a violation of the constitution, it would seem that such action by the court would form a proper basis for legislative nullification of the court's action. On the other hand, if the court shall find the extradition charges sustained by the evidence, there would be no basis for legislative nullification. Arbitration would be held for extradition to Yugoslavia and no action of the Congress on his residence status would be necessary. Arbitration's counsel (petitioner) suggested to the Immigration and Naturalization Service that hearings on extradition proceedings should be postponed until the courts finally acted, so that the Service, if it ruled unfavorably upon Arbitration's request for extradition, would not be forced to

directional relief, would be setting upon basis of accusations which had not been established by conviction; in effect, it would be judging a man guilty before conviction—a complete reversal of the American justice system. The American justice system, of justice, had consistently theretofore held that an accused person is innocent until proven guilty. In view of the prejudicial effect of the proposed law, the bill is being withheld by presidential action upon basis of accusations which depend upon the testimony of a single individual, and not of accusations established by conviction. The result, if passed, would inevitably thus, in no respect, do just treatment; admini-

intrusively. He has asked Coates to hold in abeyance an action upon the bill in his favor until the courts render final judgment upon his extradition case. At this point in my remarks, I wish to include some of the many fine state-

[illegible]

RECEIVED SACRAMENTO (NORCAL),  
WESTERN UNION, CALIF., JUNE 23, 1955.

Member of Congress,  
Roosevelt Building  
Washington, D. C.

[illegible][illegible]

Paragraph 8 beginning on page 1, stated that Artukovic sought to achieve his intended status to that of permanent resident alien. The applications were not successful. The Artukovic had earned

certainly is a witness not to be overlooked. His wife, an American, spent the years 1941-1942 in Italy and also later. He was attributed to last in Croatia and also in the Balkans. Father Mendis, who was provided (I think) by the American Embassy in Belgrade, was a Protestant. Father in Croatia during those years would also be a very interesting witness. So would Father Jacoby, Ambassador (now Cardinal) Skopljak's secretary during those years. He is a most willing witness for the defense.

[illegible]

**ELLY. ROBERTS ROSE**

I, Rev. Fred Dr. Louis Truett, being duly sworn on oath depose and say: I was born in Ottawa and that I was residing at 1449 Roswell Boulevard, Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

I have known Andrija "Archie" Glass since his family was in Alton, Ontario, in 1944. I was also living in Alton in November 1944. I traveled with Andrija

[illegible]

**OWEN R. CHAMBERLAIN**  
**Notary Public.**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

That amount, while he was working in C

That Dr. Audrius Artuzovic desired

!

STATE OF ILLINOIS

That to hundreds of French soldiers, w

That E.T. Anderson was not: a New York Times columnist? During the

**DELGOTTI BOOKS**  
**Subscribe and save 10% before the 11th**

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**That agent was residing in Croatia during**

1. That Andrija Artukovic helped all the unfortunate persecuted people. That

3. When American and British troops went to bomb Germany and were forced

That agent known by his own knowledge

DR. VILMO BILAL, JR.

!;

That effort was in Croatia during Dec.

**That many French civilians and soldiers**

Very Rev. Dr. Vasil Vencelin, Rev.  
Dr. Ignatius Jurkovic, Rev. Prof. Dr.  
Kruno Pandak, and Rev. Celestin Raguz,  
all of Chicago, Ill.

The above statement of facts with supporting affidavits leads me to the conclusion that our Government is unjustly persecuting Dr. Artibon, and in so doing we are violating our cardinal principle of freedom. To me it is just as unthinkable not only to permit, but to encourage the extradition of Dr. Artibon as it would be to insist, on the extradition of the Polish pilot who had been sentenced last year, and was granted the North Atlantic flight, or to permit the North American Pilot to extradite this pilot who was a Russian. I will therefore demand freedom and reward for the pilot who had served a \$100,000 bond for stealing the

The American public should be aroused over the high-handed treatment administered by the Immigration Service, and insist that human justice and true equality be given this Croatian peckto.

**WORK MANAGEMENT**

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous orders at the House, the spokesman from each formula (Mr. HOFFMANN) is recognised for

15 minutes.

Mr. HOLMFELD asked and was given the following answers:

Q. Did you permit and directed the personnel to review and extract the reports?

A. Yes.

Q. Mr. HOLMFELD. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times of July 14, 1966, and Los Angeles papers throughout the country carried accounts of the Hoover Commission report and its task-force report on passport management. This was the second of two sets of reports on this subject, the first one having been submitted, I understand, to the House Committee in January 1966.

Q. Mr. HOLMFELD. The Hoover Commission report on passport management, which was introduced as a House measure,

In this case, it happened that the first draft of the report was not released by Hoover. Commission this year dealt with the same subject of payment management. Although the Commission was sent out of existence on July 1, the second part of the report on payment management was not actually released until 11 days later.

The manner in which this report was published, together with the lack of substance to some of the findings and conclusions mentioned therein, led the press July 16.

I was dissatisfied with the impression of the task force from the very beginning. When it was first proposed to publish the report in the past, I questioned the advisability of such a procedure, a memorandum to the Commission.

December 11, 1964, I stated:





July 29

Two separate reports dealing with the same closely related subject matters are apt to cause confusion in later references to the results of study and are not warranted by the state of the information.

The Commission, nevertheless, issued the report in two parts. Thus we have a task force report and a Commission report on paperwork management. The task force report in each case was prepared by a group headed by Emmett J. Leahy, who operates a management consultant firm in this field. Mr. Leahy also directed a task force study of the first Hoover Commission on the subject of records management.

Mr. Leahy has not been bashful about identifying his business position in the task force report. Publications of the firm are cited as footnotes. The first part I of the task force report and the remainder of his first Hoover Commission report. This section reminds the reader: "Part I was written by the Chairman, Emmett J. Leahy, of Leahy & Co., who is also responsible for its shortcomings."

I am sure that the report has shortcomings. Mr. Speaker, although I have not had time to analyze all of them. In a separate statement in connection with the second part of the Hoover Commission report on paperwork management I said:

A continuing objective should be the elimination of reports that are costly and unproductive. Reports that are costly and unproductive are a waste of Government money. Evaluation of the need for Government reports, however, is not always a simple matter. Vital policy decisions may be involved in the elimination of law and the affecting of business firms with Federal regulations and regulations.

The task force on paperwork management undertook upon its first assignment to make an analysis of the Government as an agency and business groups in an effort to reduce or eliminate reporting requirements in selected target areas. In effect the task force used the authority of the Commission to force Government agencies to make a study of the new changes which were not passed upon by the Commission itself.

The task force was set up as a study group to assist the Commission in its effort to make the Commission for the task force to make a study of the Government's own responsibility and before reporting to the Commission.

One of the incidents I had particularly in mind when I wrote that statement is described in the following letter to John B. Hollister, then Executive Director of the Commission:

Mr. John B. Hollister,

Executive Director, Commission on Government Paperwork Management.

Dear Mr. Hollister: It has come to my attention that a staff member of the task force on paperwork management has directed a letter to members of the Interstate Commerce Commission requesting that they make a study of the Commission's records which are maintained in certain railroad trading studies. The letter to the ICC, signed by Edward T. Freil, assistant staff director, contains the following paragraph:

"As this task force has concluded that the Interstate Commerce Commission's records are not a primary cost and as the operating elements within the Interstate Commerce Commission have agreed that these studies are not a primary cost finding in their

regulatory operations. It is recommended that the subject matter be discontinued. It is further recommended that the Commission take the necessary steps to rescind the order of September 2, 1946, which established these studies. Submission of our work to the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch, and through them to the Congress, these recommendations would not then be a part of our report would result in the Commission's being in a position to make a statement to both industry and its regulatory body."

In my opinion, this kind of action by a task force or any of its staff is completely unauthorized and unwarranted. It is the duty of the Commission to discontinue the studies in question, the task force has no business making such representations to effect changes in agency actions.

I would suggest that the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission be advised that the Commission has taken no position on this matter, that no task force or other persons are authorized to speak for the Commission in this capacity, and that no recommendations or recommendations are made to the Congress. Also, I believe that the persons responsible for sending the above-quoted letter to the ICC should be properly reprimanded.

I would appreciate being advised on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Clare Hoffman,

Member of Congress.

Although Mr. Hoover assured me at a Commission meeting that the person committing this improper action had been called to account, the fact still remains that the second part of the Commission report on paperwork management did little more than to repeat its task force experiment and repeat its estimates of savings.

At the meeting of the House Committee on Government Operations, I am acquainted with the reports which the General Services Administration has been making to the Congress concerning progress in the management of costly paperwork. It was my privilege to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations which handled the legislation which was the first major step in the Federal Records Act of 1950. This was the first major step in the Federal Records Act of 1950, which established the General Services Administration. My subcommittee was also responsible for reporting out the basic legislation in 1949.

Since the Federal Records Act of 1950 was enacted, the General Services Administration has been hard at work battling against the waste known to exist in Government paperwork. Some of its results are notable, and for these the Hoover Commission should be given credit. Mr. Speaker, but it is understood that the General Services Administration should not be left that the closing of this records center and the resultant savings are due to the appearance of the Hoover Commission and task force reports.

For example, part II of the Commission report on paperwork management states at page 11:

More unaccounted agency record centers are being closed as the Commission's recommendations. The Veterans Administration re-

ords center will be liquidated by July 1, with savings in the Government of space, equipment, and personnel estimated at \$1,077,000.

According to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the recommendation for the closing of the VA records center, located at Columbia, Ohio, was made by a private records management firm, known as Records Engineering, Inc. The contractor estimated savings of \$1,100,000 in personnel and \$970,000 in space and equipment. Senate Committee on Appropriations—Senate Committee on Independent and Special Investigations, 1954, page 151.

The Hoover Commission report does not cite the accomplishment of this or any other private firm in records management work, but it does say at page 12:

A private management consultant is studying the proper relationships between the Department of Defense and the Central Services Administration record centers.

I find in the record of the Senate Appropriations hearings the following item of information by the Acting Administrator of General Services:

On March 14, 1954, a contract was let to the Hoover Commission to study the records management and records center systems of the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration. The objective of this survey is to determine the extent of the records management problem and to recommend a consolidation of existing systems. This survey is to be completed in 6 months at a cost of \$25,000.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the "private management consultant" referred to by the Hoover Commission, report happens to be the firm of the chairman of the task force himself, employed by General Services Administration to do the defense study while he had a number of his staff were employed by the Hoover Commission.

I hope that the House Committee on Government Operations through its subcommittee on reorganization, will find time to make a thorough study of the background of all the task force members who served on the Hoover Commission. There is good reason to believe that public and private interests were not always clearly distinguished in the recommendations of these task forces.

In the case of the paperwork management task force, it appears that the Hoover Commission was in a good advertising medium for Leahy & Co.

I do not object to private firms being hired to make surveys in records management. The General Services Administration related to the Senate Appropriations Committee that such firms can be helpful in highly specialized areas of records management, such as microfilming. Frequently they bring to the job a fresh approach and a new point of view based on studies of industry operations—Senate Committee on Appropriations, hearings on the supplemental appropriation bill, 1951, page 164.

I notice in the Appropriations Committee hearings that the same firm, Records Engineering, Inc., which was the private management consultant, was retained to make a survey of Post Office records. Savings from this project are estimated at more than \$7 million most